

United States Patent and Trademark Office



APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/056,619	01/23/2002	David S. Knowles	99-0013-1	1655	
759	90 02/18/2004		EXAMINER		
William Cray			VY, HUNG T		
Cymer, Inc. Leg MS/4-2C	al Dept.		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
17075 Thornmint Court			2828		
San Diego,, CA	92127		DATE MAII ED: 02/18/200	DATE MAILED: 02/18/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			Kh			
٠ هـ	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	10/056,619	KNOWLES ET AL.				
Advisory Action	Examin r	Art Unit				
	Hung T Vy	2828				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sh et with the c	orrespondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 14 January 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this applic 1) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper rep ch places the applic	ply to a cation in			
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expires 3_months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ad event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exter 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortene (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three mearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	visory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the nan SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THI ate on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 insion and the corresponding amount of the distatutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. \$ 136(a) and the appropriate extended the final Office action; or	See MPEP e extension fee tension fee under (2) as set forth in			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:						
(a) they raise new issues that would require furth	ner consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);				
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or s	simplifying the			
(d) they present additional claims without cance NOTE:	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claii	ms.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reje						
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	d be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely file	d amendment			
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because: S		sidered but does NO	OT place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	:					
Claim(s) allowed: <u>1-77</u> .						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: 78-154.						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) ap	proved or b)□ disapproved by	the Examiner.				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	. 0				

PAUL IP
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAM

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

10. Other: ____

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Claim 78 contains news subject matter of "4000 gas discharges per second" which is not supported by the original specification. "4000 gas discharges per second" is not quiv lent with term "4000 HZ or 4000 pulses per second" b cause Hz id defined by pulses per s cond There is no such thing of gas discharges per second and it is not equivalent to HZ. The claims 78-154 are not patentably distinct from the rejection of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.